

701.d 14

A.

LETTER

TO THE

Rev^d. Mr. LAMB.

OCCASION'D by his Remarks on a Book intitl'd,

A

PLAIN ACCOUNT, &c.

OF THE

SACRAMENT.

To all his Piety and Learning, and the good Use that has been made of it, is added a Temper happy beyond Expression: A Sweet, Easy, Modest, Inoffensive, Obliging Behaviour, adorn all his Actions; and no Passion, Vanity, Insolence, or Ostentation, appear either in what he Writes or Says—And because his Study of the Scriptures has betrayed him into a Suspicion of some Heretical Opinions, He must be blacken'd and defam'd.—And He that has so many Shining Qualities, must be insulted by every Worthless Wretch, as if he had as little Learning and Virtue as the lowest of those who are against him.

Difficulties and Discouragements, Page 19.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. OSBORN, at the Golden-Ball in
Pater-noster-Row. M.DCC.XL.

THE

LIBRARY

OF THE

CONGRESS

OF THE UNITED STATES

OF AMERICA

WASHINGTON

1851

NO. 1

1851

1851

1851

A
L E T T E R
 T O
Mr. L A M B,
 Occasion'd by his Remarks on the
PLAIN ACCOUNT
 O F T H E
S A C R A M E N T.

S I R,

IN the Beginning of your Introduction, which is a Sort of Letter to the Author of the *Plain Account of the Sacrament*, you profess yourself a sincere Christian; and in several Passages of your Remarks, you affect a high Strain of Piety: But whether your Zeal has not spent itself, in a passionate Contest about One part of Religion, while you are very deficient in the

Practice of Another, and whether it has not been your Endeavour, to fill your Head with Notions, rather than your Heart with Good Affections, I shall leave to your cool and serious Consideration.

YOUR Treatment of an Author, whose Performance has all the Marks of Seriousness and Sincerity that a Book can have, and in which I am sure there is not an Instance of any Levity of Expression, or which in the least favours the Cause of Profaneness or Infidelity, is by no means consistent with the Spirit of That Religion which you pretend so zealously to Support. And your charging him with “ having taken industrious, but
 “ wicked Pains in it; that his writing such a
 “ Treatise, and publishing it to the World,
 “ at the same time that he pretends to be a
 “ Christian and a Clergyman, is shocking;
 “ that he has not given this Account in Simplicity, Truth, or Godly Sincerity; and
 “ that you cannot but suspect his Design to
 “ have something in it besides Honesty:” These Charges, I say, Sir, upon the Author of a Book, which has all the Appearances of Piety and Sincerity strong in its Favour, are what in my Opinion neither a Good nor a Wise Man can justify. And till you can
 know

know the Author's Design to be Contrary to what he Professes, by looking into his Heart, I may retort this Expression with great Propriety upon You, *Thou art inexcusable, O Man, whoever thou art*, that thus judgest another.

I BELIEVE the World has been oblig'd, *has thought and acknowledg'd itself oblig'd*, for many Performances, which, tho' excellent in themselves, have yet on their first appearing, *scandaliz'd some Honest Christians*, as much as The Plain Account seems now to have *offended you*: And if nothing should ever have been publish'd, but what *All Honest Christians would approve, and be pleased with*, unless they could be All Wise and Sensible Christians too, which it is plain they are not, we must have lost perhaps some of the Best and most Valuable Books in the World. If it is notorious, that some of the best and most sincere Christians, are mistaken in Points of great Importance, and in danger of such Errors as make Religion Burdensome; it is surely highly commendable, nay it is the Duty of such as have the Care of Souls committed to them, to endeavour to set them right, and to take off any Impressions which they might have received to their Prejudice.

Prejudice. And This was the confessed Purpose, This the Honest Design of the Author of the Plain Account, as he has told us in his Preface to it ; and which, till we are able to prove the contrary, we are bound in common Charity to believe.

WHETHER he has acquitted himself with the Art and Spirit of a Good Writer, or has rais'd Expectations which he has not answer'd, is another Consideration ; and which must be left to the Determination and the Judgment of his Readers. But that you should charge a Man with having a " Profane Design, with Traducing this Institution, and with resolving to reconcile it to those particular Persons, who cannot be reconcil'd to the Use of That ; [p. 3.] with having given this Account, not to recommend it to the Attendance and Practice of sincere Christians, but to reconcile some particular Persons to the Use of it, by making it appear trifling and insignificant," [19.] with many more Imputations, as False and Unjust as they are Bitter and Uncharitable ; I say, That you should Charge a Man with having Designs, which you can know nothing of, which are directly contrary to his Declarations, which are not to be In-

fer'd

ferr'd from any thing in his Performance, and which therefore have no Existence anywhere but in your own Brain, and yet with all this Abuse and Defamation, with all this Antichristian Malice and Scurrility, *that you should at the same time pretend to be a Christian, and profess yourself a Clergyman,* (to retort one of your own Expressions once more upon you) *the one is shocking; and as to the other, your Performance will never pass for a Proof of it.*

I HOPE These are not what you mean, by the *Features and Beauty of Primitive Christianity*, which, in your Dedication, you seem to think, you have drawn *to the Life* in your Performance: No, Sir, the Lines of Malice and Rancour are too strong to admit of any Resemblance, and discover much more of the Heat and Bigotry of the Limner, as you call yourself, than of the Amiability of That Religion which you pretend so skilfully to delineate. I think it is plain from the Expressions which I have quoted just above, that without any Provocation which could justify You especially who seem to have a great Sense of Religion, in shewing so much Passion, you have given

no

no Quarter to an Author, as Grave and Serious as, I believe, ever appear'd in Print; and who has deliver'd his Sentiments on this Institution, which are different from Other People's, with all That Candour that becomes a Christian and a Gentleman.

OUR Blessed Saviour has told us, that a Tree is known by its Fruits; that the Value and Importance of any Principles in Religion, are to be measur'd by the good Effects which they produce in the Lives of Men; and if this Rule is to determine us in the Judgment which we form of Your Principles and the Principles of the Author of the Plain Account, we must conclude your Religions to be very Different—but that His is Amiable and Inviting, and Yours Frightful and Unfriendly. He has propos'd his Opinions relating to this Institution, with the Meekness and Simplicity so often recommended in the Gospel of *Jesus Christ*; and tho' he disagrees with others about it, yet he does not defame and reproach them upon That Account; but does it with *a great Concern on his Own Part, and a great Respect toward Them*; and says, it would be a Pleasure to him, not to find himself under a Necessity

cessity of differing from them. He does not censure those who have treated this Subject in a way which he thinks Erroneous, with having *bad Intentions*, nor does he attribute what he thinks a Perversion of Scripture, to *a most shameless Front*; but like One who is truly sensible What manner of Spirit a Follower of *Christ*, and especially a Teacher of his Religion should be of, he imputes the Errors of other People, to the Strength of a long Prepossession, or to the want of Judgment; and not to their *resolving to explain away the Import and Meaning of Scripture, to oblige some particular Friends*.

—But now You, Sir, on the contrary, as tho' you had forgot the many plain Directions of your Lord and Master, instead of Meekness and Simplicity, propose your Opinions with great Uncharitableness and Pride; impute Designs and Consequences to Another Person, whom you are not acquainted with, and which He never meant; and oppose your Own Sentiments to His, about an Important Point of the Religion of *Christ*, with so much Heat and Animosity, as I wish I could not say, discovers a Spirit within you, Inconsistent with the Views and Influence of

B

His

His Religion. You are not contented with wresting your Adversary's Expressions to the Purposes of your Own Inveterate Rage and Malice, but, regardless of Our Saviour's Precept, *Judge not, that you be not judged*, you will look into his Heart, and discover That to be *full of all Subtilty and all Mischief, abandoning his Reason and Sincerity, and perverting the Right Ways of the Lord*. Do You find, Sir, any Countenance given to such a Disposition in the Gospel of *Jesus Christ*, either in His Precept or Example? Are These the Fruits of Your Principles of Christianity, which you seem to value yourself so much upon, *and which, working in you, brought forth this Effect*? If all This is owing to your Natural Temper, instead of engaging yourself in a furious Contest about some particular disputable Opinions, it should rather have been your Concern, to have imploy'd your Zeal for Religion, in amending your Heart and Practice; and to shew in the Peace and Simplicity of your Own Manners, that You Yourself believe Christianity to be a True Institution, requiring from its Professors an Observance of its Precepts, and to let the World see by an evident Demonstration, What an Ornament

ment to Nature is the Spirit of this Religion, and how very Amiable the Christian makes the Man. But if this is not owing to your Natural Disposition, but to an intemperate and mistaken, to a furious and ill-conducted Zeal; then what Pity it is, that you should be Better by Nature than you are by Grace, and that your Religion should only serve to form a Disposition, which, if left to itself perhaps would have made you agreeable in Every State, Office, and Character of Life!

PERHAPS you may think, that such a way of treating your Adversary will be look'd upon by some People, as a smart manner of Writing, and give you the Reputation of a keen Author of good Parts and Courage: But let me tell you, Sir, that False and Railing Accusations will never advance your Credit. For tho' in Matters of Politicks, these things are us'd with some Success, yet they are very Unbecoming in the Business of Religion, which you know is of a solemn serious Nature. And tho' such Overbearing and Reproachful Treatment may suit well enough with the Spirit of Party, yet you must acknowledge, when you consider it coolly, that it is utterly unsuitable to the Spirit of the Gospel, where, instead of any En-

deavours which will serve only to inflame the Passions of Mankind, and to stir up their Resentments because of a different way of thinking, tho' in Matters of the last Importance, our Saviour has, on the other hand, requir'd us to Imitate the immense Benevolence of the Deity, and injoin'd us the Practice of Love and Charity, as the Bond of Peace and Virtue,

YOU say, " as far as the Effects of *The*
 " *Plain Account* are come to your Know-
 " ledge, it is found that there are great Num-
 " bers of Honest Sincere Christians that dis-
 " approve and condemn it, for not *One* that
 " approves, much less is pleas'd with it; and
 " that it seems to You an impossible thing
 " that any Sincere Understanding Christian
 " should receive Satisfaction therefrom." If
 These, Sir, are the Effects which you have
 found from the Book, what need you have
 given yourself any Trouble to confute it;
 and why must You be *Nine Months* about
 it? What Occasion was there, if not *One*
 approv'd or was pleas'd with it, that You should
 revive an Examination of it, after it has been
 publish'd above Four Years, and much abler
 Pens

Pens than Your's had been imploy'd in Answering it? which, tho' not dipt in so much Gall, shew'd full as much Zeal against it, and by avoiding Personal Spleen, wrote with more Good Sense and Virtue, and betray'd less of the Weakness of their Cause. How *impossible a thing* soever it may *seem to You*, Sir, it is not only Possible, but I assure you it is strictly True, that many *Christians* as *Sincere* as Yourself, and who I have great reason to believe are much more *Understanding*, have receiv'd great *Satisfaction* from This Account of the Sacrament; in which, instead of any Unintelligible Senseless Jargon, they see the Nature of it expounded by the known Principles of Reason; they see the Tendency of it to Purify and Adorn Human Life; and instead of Traducing the Institution, as You have maliciously and shockingly represented Him, or of making it a Matter of Intricacy or Terror, The Author has greatly recommended it, by making it Plain, Rational and Intelligible to Common Understandings.

BUT it is now high Time to have done with your Introduction, which affords no great Prospect indeed of Pleasure or Edification

tion in what's to follow ; that I should however proceed to examine the Work itself, and no longer disturb the Satisfaction which you must take, in Contemplating the Fairness and Candour, the Respect and Decency, the Good Temper and Ingenuity, wherewith you have treated a Serious and very Learned Adversary.

BUT your First Remark is so Trifling, and has such a Tendency to delude your Reader, and prejudice him against the Author you are confuting, that if I was not determin'd to expose the Matter as well as the Manner of your Performance, I should be discourag'd from going any farther, with One who is capable of any thing so wretched and contemptible. You say that the Author's " first levelling Stroke is laid at the *Authority and* " *Obligation* of the Holy Sacrament, by telling us that it is a Positive Duty made such " by Institution *alone*; where the word " ALONE is very emphatical, and implies " not only that it was not a Duty *without* or " *before* the Institution, but also (according " to some late Doctrines) that it is not a Duty " of so high an Obligation as it might have " been,

“ been, or not of so great Authority as some
 “ other Duties are.” You have taken a part
 of Two Propositions in The Plain Account,
 and tack’d them together, in order to make
 them speak what you had a Mind to ; and
 therefore ’tis fit that I fairly represent them,
 before I go any farther. The First Proposi-
 tion in the Author’s own Words is this :
 “ The partaking of the Lord’s Supper, is not
 “ a Duty of Itself, or a Duty apparent to us
 “ from the Nature of Things ; but a Duty
 “ made such to Christians, by the Positive
 “ Institution of *Jesus Christ*.” Now where
 is the Word ALONE, which you say is so
 Emphatical too? And yet Here it is that he
 has told us, that it is a Positive Duty made
 such by Institution ; but as you find it in the
 next Proposition, where he says—*All Po-*
sitive Duties, or Duties made such by In-
stitution alone—you have taken the Word
 ALONE from hence, and added it to the
 Other, where you say it is very Emphatical,
 tho’ it is not printed in any Character that de-
 notes an Emphasis or Stress to be laid upon it
 at all : And if you had not added this Cir-
 cumstance, I might have pass’d over the Un-
 fairness of the Quotation without perceiving
 it,

it, as thinking it made no material Difference, after he had said it was not a Duty of Itself, or apparent to us from the Nature of Things, whether the Author had added, that it was made such by the Positive Institution of *Jesus Christ*, or by positive Institution alone. But this discovers a Meanness and Disingenuity, which gives one an Impression not much to your Advantage, and indeed is a Specimen of the low shallow Artifice which runs all thro' your Work.

ALLOWING that the Author had said as you represent him, That the Sacrament is a Duty made such by Institution alone, Does it therefore imply, that it is not a Duty of so high an Obligation as it might have been, or not of so great Authority as some Other Duties are? I know you have been pleas'd to affirm this, but That does not make it True; and I remember you have charg'd your Adversary with an *Ipse dixi*, and a most shameless Front, for saying what He had a good Foundation for, and which you have not disprov'd; but what is here to be charg'd upon You? who have taken upon you first to insert a Word for your Author which you do not find in That Sentence, then to say it is there very Emphatical, tho' it has no Marks of any

Em-

Emphasis intended where it is us'd, and then to spy an Implication in it, which no body else can see besides Yourself, if it was there. For if the Sacrament is made a Duty by Institution alone, then it does not result from the Eternal Order and Nature of Things; it is not injoin'd us for its Own Sake, on Account of its Own Natural and Intrinsic Goodness. This is All that can be implied in the Word ALONE in this Place, which you say is very Emphatical; and tho' you add, that it is according to some late Doctrines, that the Sacrament is not of so great Authority as some other Duties are, or of so high an Obligation as it might have been, yet I never heard of any one that has broach'd or countenanc'd That Doctrine: But that (which is what I suppose you mean) it is not of so great Efficacy as Moral Virtues, you may learn from Archbishop TILLOTSON, if His Authority will have any Weight with you, who says, * “ The Ritual and Instrumental Parts
 “ of Religion, and all Laws and Duties concerning Them, are of less Value and Esteem
 “ with God, than those that are of a Moral
 “ Nature.;—and if we consider the Matter

* Ser. Vol. 4. Ser. 2.

“ well, we shall see the Reason to be very
 “ plain, because Natural and Moral Duties
 “ are approved of God for Themselves, for
 “ their Own Sake, and upon Account of
 “ their own Natural and Intrinsick Good-
 “ ness; but the Ritual and Instrumental Parts
 “ of Religion, are only pleasing to God *in*
 “ *order to These, and so far* as they tend to
 “ beget and promote them in us.” I grant
 you, that God has requir’d our Obedience to
 the Positive Institution of the Sacrament, as
 well as to Moral Virtues; but is it a Duty in
 Itself, apparent to us from the Nature of
 Things, and is it made so by any thing besides
 the Positive Institution of *Jesus Christ*? If
 you can bring any Proof of this from Scrip-
 ture and from Reason, you will invalidate
 what the Author has said in The Plain Ac-
 count; but till you can, His Proposition will
 stand in full Force, Unanswer’d and not
 Weakned by You.

YOUR Adversary having said, that “ it is
 “ not to be doubted that *Christ* sufficiently
 “ declar’d to his First and Immediate Fol-
 “ lowers, the Whole of what he design’d
 “ should be Understood or Imply’d in it,”
 Your next Remark is by Way of Question,
Whether it is reasonable to suppose, that our
Saviour

Saviour said nothing more concerning This Duty at the first Institution of it, than what is recorded by the Evangelists? I think I may presume to say that He did not; and my Reason for this Assertion is, that if He made any other Declarations, of the Nature, the Design, and the Due Manner of Partaking of this Supper, than what is included in the Account which the Evangelists have given us, I doubt we must bring a Charge of great Unfaithfulness against Them; that They have recorded an Institution from the Mouth of *Jesus Christ*, which all his Disciples are under an Obligation to comply with, and yet have not discover'd the Methods in which He order'd it to be Obey'd, which are therefore Essential to it, and for want of which we can still observe it but Imperfectly. But if our Saviour did Not say any thing more concerning it, than what the Evangelists have recorded, as it is reasonable, in My Opinion, to suppose, *upon a Point which depended upon His Will entirely*, then it is plain that What They have told us, is the Whole which He design'd should be Understood or Implied in it; and it is consequently of no Importance to know what

his Followers or their Successors have taught concerning it.

You have given us a long Quotation out of *Exodus* about the Institution of the *Jewish* Passover, and then ask “ whether it
 “ can be reasonably thought that our Saviour
 “ should abrogate This, and Institute Another
 “ Passover in its Room, the Memorial of a
 “ Greater and far more Valuable Deliverance
 “ than That out of *Egypt*, in so few Words
 “ as the Evangelists and St. *Paul* express?”
 To which I answer, by asking you Another Question: Can it reasonably be thought that our Saviour should Institute a Duty which the Nature of Things could never teach us, which depends intirely on His Own Appointment, and which without His Institution could never have been incumbent on us; and yet that the Evangelists, who had his express Direction to Publish all the parts of his Religion to the World, and who have given us an exact and minute Account of his Life and Doctrine, should conceal from us any thing relating to This Institution, to the Nature, the Design, or the Due Manner of our observing it? No—And therefore to say, that These are not the *only* true Relation of it, not the *only* authentick Declaration to be depended

depended upon, and from which we ought not with the greatest Care and Honesty to take *All* our Notions of This Duty, *is so extravagant a Proposition*, to use Your Own Expression, which I suppose You will like better than one of Mine, *as could never have proceeded from the Mouth or Pen of any Man, who had not first abandon'd both his Reason and Sincerity*. For what is This but to say, that *the Successors of the Apostles, the Ministers of the Gospel*, may interpret Texts of Scripture according to their Own Imaginations, and by Virtue of their Own Authority, which their Hearers are to believe and confide in, tho' they reach *more* than was ever intended or contained in such Texts? *The Ministers of the Gospel*, I grant you, may take upon them to explain This Duty; neither has the Author ever deny'd it in The Plain Account; and if They do it in such a Manner as He has done, if they never add any thing to it of their Own Invention, which is not in the Original Account of it in the New Testament; and if they never attempt to make up any Defect, where they suppose our Saviour not to have spoke, or the Apostles not to have deliver'd down, his Mind plainly about it, they may then expect to be attended to;

to; and This is a sufficient Answer to the Question which you ask your Adversary so pertly, By what Authority He has given This Account, and who gave Him this Authority?

YOUR next Remark is imploy'd upon the Author's finding fault with "our *English* Translators, for adding the Word IT without any thing in the Original to answer to "it or require it." You charge him with *finding fault and doing the same thing; instead of IT, having added the Word GOD, upon which Interpolation he fixes a Sense of the Word εὐλογέω, to which it is by no means to be confin'd.* If you will give yourself the trouble to look over this Passage in The Plain Account once more, you will see that the Author only says, that "if instead "of IT, *the Translators* had added the "Word GOD, (*which they had full as much "Reason to do*) the Meaning of the Evangelists would truly have been express'd;" and gives several Reasons why Blessing God, is the natural Sense of the Word in this Place.

YOUR Fourth Remark is added only to increase their Number, I suppose, and swell the Bulk of your Performance: You cavil at the Author's saying "that the Bread and
Wine

“ Wine were appointed as Memorials of his
 “ Body *actually* given, and of his Blood
 “ *actually* shed, *after* he should be taken
 “ from them ; that it was to call to Remem-
 “ brance a Sacrifice *already* offer’d, and that
 “ the very Essence of it is a Remembrance
 “ of a *past* Transaction.” In answer to this
 You say, that *we find in Fact this Holy Feast*
was instituted and actually celebrated be-
fore the Death of Christ was past. Won-
 derful Discovery ! But this, Sir, was done to
 shew them what He meant by this Institution,
 and the Manner in which they were to cele-
 brate this Feast. But if it was a Rite intended
 for Christians of All Ages of the World,
in Remembrance of His Death, perhaps
 you think it should not have been Instituted
 by Him during his Life ; but that after his Re-
 surrection He should have deliver’d his Mind
 about it, when his Death, which it was to
 remember, was already past. You say that
a thing may be done in Remembrance of a
Transaction to come, and ask your Author,
 what he thinks of the High Priest’s entering
 in once every Year into the Holy Place with
 Blood ? which I believe will make no Im-
 pression on him, having already made it clear,
 that there can be no Remembrance of a thing
 Done,

Done, which is *not* done and past; neither will your Instance about the King and his Proclamation serve your Purpose. For if the King should promise to release all Persons out of Prison, on such a Day in such a Year, and should require his Subjects to observe this Day annually, till the Time came, as a Day of Thanksgiving, it may be a Memorial, if you please, that he has *Promis'd* to release them, but it can be no *Remembrance* that they *are* *Releas'd* till the Thing is past, and what he has promis'd is fulfill'd. But to what Purpose is all this cavilling? Whether they could do the Actions here mention'd in Remembrance of him, whilst He Himself was present with them, or not, you allow that it was instituted at first in Remembrance of his Body and Blood *proposed* to be given and shed, and to be afterwards the Memorial of them *actually* given and shed. *A Distinction more Curious than Necessary.* For
 “ the End for which He instituted this Duty,
 “ is *still* the Remembrance of Himself; the
 “ Bread to be taken is appointed to be the
 “ Memorial of his Body broken, and the
 “ Wine to be drunk is ordain'd to be the
 “ Memorial of his Blood shed,” which are
 the Author's Words in the Plain Account
 and

and which are not contradicted by any thing that you have said.

THE next Remark you make, is on the Author's Account of the Examination requir'd by St. *Paul*; but you patch up something out of three or four different Pages, and quote it as One distinct Sentence in The Plain Account; which is a very unfair way of treating your Adversary, but which you are very often, nay generally guilty of. You say, " The Author tells us, [*p.* 71, 72.] that " *All* the Examination requir'd by St. *Paul*, " in order to a worthy partaking of this " Holy Sacrament, is that the Communicant " make this One single Enquiry (at the very " time of Communicating, [*p.* 112.] the " Word NOW in *Italian* Characters) *viz.* " whether he apprehend differently of this " holy Rite, and of a Common Meal and " an Ordinary Eating and Drinking." The Author does *not* say, that this is *All* the Examination requir'd by St. *Paul*, tho' You have been pleas'd (for what Reason you know best) to insert That Word for him, and to print it in *Italicks*; but his Words are, *The Examination here mention'd by St. Paul.* You have likewise with unparallel'd Modesty connected, or rather, I might say, confounded

D

his

his Comment on the Exhortation in the Communion Office, where he says it engages the Persons present Now to judge themselves, with what he has said on the Examination mention'd by St. *Paul*; and represent him as saying, that All the Examination requir'd by St. *Paul*, is that the Communicant make this One Single Enquiry, at the very time of Communicating, the Word NOW in *Italian* Characters. Whereas, as I said before, this Word is in the Explanation of the Communion Office; neither indeed is there any such Expression in The Plain Account, as that *All the Examination requir'd by St. Paul, is that the Communicant make this one single Enquiry at the very time of Communicating.* Is this, Sir, a fair or an honest way of confuting an Author? Was it the Sense of your Weakness in any other Method, or your Zeal against Heresy, that tempted you to this Injustice? Again:

BECAUSE the Author had said, that “ the
 “ whole Affair of Eating and Drinking Un-
 “ worthily in St. *Paul's* Sense, is confin'd to
 “ the Frame of our Minds, and our Beha-
 “ viour at the Time of our Performance of
 “ this Duty,” you therefore wisely infer,
 that it necessarily confines the Guilt of Eating
 and

and Drinking Unworthily, to the strict Imitation of the *Corinthian* Sinners, in the One particular Instance of their Indecency; and then because he says in Another Place, that *He does not so confine it*, you charge him with a *Palpable Contradiction*. A Palpable Contradiction it is, I grant you, to Your Inference, but not to any thing He Himself has said, or which can justly and properly be concluded from it.

WHENEVER you take leave to Syllogise again, I recommend it to you, not to insert more in the Conclusion, than you put into the Premises; for tho' you think your Proposition will be granted, That whatever is Implied in this Duty is the *Proper* Subject of Examination, yet you must not imagine, that your Conclusion from it is just, or will command our Assent to it, That it is therefore the *Necessary Duty* of every worthy Communicant: And yet if you had not attempted to prove that it is the *Necessary Duty*, your Syllogism would have answer'd no End at all towards confuting the Author you have to do with. You see, Sir, what poor Shifts you are reduc'd to, to make any thing like an Answer to an Author so much above your Match; and who besides his Superior Abili-

tics, has the Advantage of Truth and Reason on his Side, and You have seldom Either. Whatever you have added of your Own, or have quoted from *The Plain Account* under this Remark, in order to invalidate or contradict what He has said about the Examination mention'd by St. *Paul*, as that it relates only to the Frame of our Minds and our Behaviour at the very Time of our Performance of this Duty, being nothing at all to the Purpose, being no Confutation or Contradiction in the least to That Proposition, requires no Other Answer.

YOUR next Remark is on the Author's *leaving out One of the Exhortations in the Communion Office*, " when he had professedly undertaken to explain this Preparation by the several Parts of That Public Office, which he passes by without the least Notice, not because it is not so Material, not because it is not so well worthy of Notice as the rest, but if you may be allow'd to guess at his Reason, because the Examination necessary is here declar'd to be not slight or short, but That of our Whole Lives and Conversations." But a careful Consideration of the Author's Design in This Part of his Book, would have let you into the
true

true Meaning of his Omission of this Exhortation, because he has intended only to enter into those Parts of the Communion Office, *in which Communicants only are concern'd* at the Time of the Celebration, to lead them all to make use of it in the most proper Christian Manner; whereas the Exhortation You refer to, relates to the Time between the Notice given, and our approaching to the Communion.

THE Author has not deny'd, nay he has expressly said, that such a Preparation as You contend for, " is a very proper Employment; is of the greatest Importance to a Christian, and may prove a Mean leading to his greater Increase in all that is worthy of a Man and a Christian: *He has said,* that a Serious Christian cannot better employ his Time upon this Occasion, than in reviving in his Own Mind the proper Thoughts upon such Subjects, as our Faith in Christ, the Acknowledgment of our being His Disciples, the Confession and Condemnation of all our Deviations from His Laws and Precepts, &c." But he has deny'd that such a Preparation is *absolutely Necessary* to the Performance of this Duty in a Manner worthy of it; and when he first
begins

begins to Treat of the Preparation for The Communion, *expresly desires it may be remember'd*, that He is now speaking only of what *is absolutely Necessary*.

YOUR Seventh Remark is on the Author's Design in writing this Account ; which he has told us was to give as good Instructions as he could, to honest well-disposed Christians, for the right Performance of the Duty of receiving the Sacrament ; and because he has mention'd the Instance of " a Christian, tho' " very blameable in some Parts of the Con- " duct of his past Life, yet coming to the " Lord's Table with a Serious Frame of " Mind, and on purpose to Remember " *Christ* in the way appointed by Himself, " as One who cannot be justly said to do this " particular Action in an improper way, un- " worthily or unsuitably to the Design of the " Institution ;" I say, because he has given this Instance, in order to settle the Point of Eating and Drinking Unworthily in St. Paul's Sense, *and to take off the Uneasiness of Honest Christians upon this Head*, You have, by a most surprizing Construction, equally Unjust, Malicious, and Uncharitable, accus'd him of " having settled this Point for the " Sake and for the Use of such as have be-
" hav'd

“ hav’d Unworthily or Unsuitably to their
 “ Holy Religion, and that These are the ho-
 “ nest well-disposed Christians, for whom he
 “ expresses so great a Concern, and for whom
 “ he designs his Account. You have accus’d
 “ him of having taken a great deal of Pains
 “ to explain away the Import and Meaning
 “ of the Words of the Apostle, and of have-
 “ ing labour’d hard, *you suppose*, according
 “ to Promise to some particular Friends, to
 “ persuade them and make them believe,
 “ that tho’ they have liv’d very wicked and
 “ blameable Lives, unsuitably and unworthy
 “ of their Christian Profession, yet that they
 “ may profess themselves and be sincere Dis-
 “ ciples of *Christ* notwithstanding. ”—A
 most Bitter, False and Wicked Accusation ! to
 which Nothing that the Author has said, with-
 out the most unnatural and perverted Con-
 struction of his Words, could lead you; and
 to which, in My Opinion, you could only
 be tempted by the Spirit of Faction, by En-
 vy of the Merit, or Spleen to the Person of
 The Author, and by the Wisdom that de-
 scendeth not from Above. And lest your
 scandalous Insinuations should not make All
 the Impression you could wish to his Preju-
 dice,

dice, you immediately add in *Italicks*, that
 “ you are the more Solicitous to observe
 “ this, and to imprint it on the Minds of
 “ Christians, because it is alone sufficient to
 “ discover the Profane Design of the Au-
 “ thor,” and which by the most Infamous
 Assertion, you make Profane indeed; but
 which is so shocking, that I shan’t Transcribe.
 —An Assertion, which, if You had heark-
 en’d to Reason or Charity, you could not
 have made; which Nothing but the Author’s
 Own Declaration, or some particular Know-
 ledge of His Life and Character, can ever
 justify; which I believe the worst Enemy he
 has besides Yourself did never think of; and
 which no body could Frame and Publish, but
 what, True or False, Right or Wrong, would
 say any thing to blacken and defame him.

WHETHER we take *Justin Martyr’s*
 Words as the Author or You have quoted
 him, it makes no sort of Difference at all;
 and therefore your Observation on his having
 quoted him generally and loosely, I must beg
 leave to say, is wholly Trifling and Impertin-
 ent. His Words are, that “ What he has
 “ said does not seem to imply in it any thing
 “ contrary to the Discipline of *Christians* in
Justin

“ *Justin Martyr’s* Age, who informs us that
 “ They only were allow’d to partake of the
 “ Eucharist, who liv’d as *Christ* commanded.”
 It is plain that the Word THEY, in this
 Place, must mean Christians, and that no
 other Sort of Persons can possibly be under-
 stood by it. Let us see then how You have
 made *Justin Martyr* say any thing more Par-
 ticular and Express by Your Quotation, which
 is This: “ The Food we call the Eucharist, of
 “ which none are allow’d to be Partakers,
 “ but such only as are True Believers, and
 “ have been baptized in the Laver of Rege-
 “ neration for the Remission of Sins, and
 “ live according to *Christ’s* Precepts;” the
 first Part of which you Yourself afterwards
 explain to mean Faith and Baptism; and in-
 deed nothing else can be intended by it.
 Now in order to adjust this important Diffe-
 rence in the Quotation, I should be glad to
 know, whether a Man can be a Christian
 without Faith, and being Baptiz’d? or if we
 call a Man a Christian, whether there is not
 necessarily included in That Denomination,
 that he believes in *Christ*, and has been Bap-
 tized? These Expressions therefore being

E
prov’d

prov'd to be Synonymous, the Living as *Christ* commanded, or according to *Christ's* Precepts, I hope you will grant are One and the Same Thing; and then there ceases to be any Difference between Your Quotation of *Justin Martyr*, and the Quotation of him in The Plain Account, about which you raise a Clamour against the Author.—And This may serve to convince the Reader of your Disposition to snarl and cavil, rather than to make any solid or just Objection.

I SHALL take no other Notice of the Account which you have given us of the Form of Discipline and Government which you say obtain'd in all Churches, *Greek, African, and Roman*, under the Heathen and Christian Emperors, (as it does not obtain in *The Church of England*, which both you and I belong to, and which we have consequently nothing to do with) but that if it *was restor'd* amongst us, which you say is very much to be wish'd, it would breed endless Contentions and Animosities, to the Ruin of the Peace of *Christendom*; that You, for your part, would make special Work with it, where you had any Authority: as may be conjectur'd

jectur'd from the Spirit which you have shewn in these Remarks; and All Others of the same flaming Zeal and holy Fury with yourself, would be sure to debar Those from partaking of this Sacrament, who had not the same Opinions and the same Zeal with Them, tho' in their Lives and Conversations they were ever so irreproachable.

YOU are very angry with the Author in your next Remark, about consecrating the Elements; but, as in most other Places, without Reason: And to make Those of your *Own Order* angry with him too, according to your wonted Custom, You make him say what you please. I suppose you thought your Readers would take every Quotation you make of him upon Trust, that they had forgot how the Author had express'd himself in The Plain Account, and would not give themselves the Trouble to examine the Original by your false and imperfect Copy. The Author having directed us to “ attend to the
 “ Words which the Minister pronounces
 “ when he delivers the Bread and Cup to us,
 “ and to make it our Own Act, by saying
 “ within ourselves, that we eat this Bread in
 “ a Religious Remembrance of *Christ's* Body

“ broken, and that we drink this Wine in a
 “ Serious and Thankful Remembrance of his
 “ Blood,” he then gives the Reason of this
 Direction, “ That This is That Personal Ap-
 “ propriation of the Bread and Wine, which
 “ alone can make this Rite of any Benefit, by
 “ making it acceptable to God ; it is, if he
 “ may use the Word, *a Sort of Consecration*
 “ of them, which is the Duty of Every Com-
 “ municant himself.” But in your Account
 of this Passage, You tell us that he says, that
Every Communicant is his Own Priest.
 Now I would ask you, Sir, the Reason why
 you quote him in Words different from his
 Own, when you make your Reader believe
 that you give his very Words? Why is this
 round Assertion, which is so contrary to
 Truth, in the Case before us? Was it that
 he might appear to break in upon the *Sacred*
Order, that you might alarm your Brethren
 with the Conceit, that They seem to be re-
 presented Useless, and that the Laity may
 usurp what has been always till now allow’d
 to be *Their Sole Prerogative*? If this was
 not your Intention, I can’t imagine why you
 did not give us his Own Words. You say,
 “ He uses the Word *Consecrating* very Ten-
 “ derly,

derly, as fearing that he should defile his
 “ Lips and Pens therewith.” Indeed, if you
 construe the Expression, *if I may use the*
Word, as using it very Tenderly, I must grant
 you this Assertion; but then I believe his
 Reason was not what You have suggested, but
 for fear he should displease such Gentlemen
 as Mr. *Lamb*, who are so fond of your Sa-
 cerdotal Powers and Authority, as to wriggle
 and be uneasy at the Application even of
 Words peculiar to your Office, to any other
 Purpose. In answer to what the Author has
 said upon this Subject, *that without This*
Consecration of the Communicant, All other
Consecrations that have gone before will do
Him no Service at all; You say, “ that the
 “ Efficacy of the Word of God preach’d,
 “ depends upon the honest and good Heart of
 “ the Hearer; but will any one affirm, that
 “ the Ministry of the Word is therefore of
 “ none Authority, of no Use and Service?”
 Yes, I affirm, that without the *honest and*
good Heart of the Hearer, the Ministry of the
 Word is of no Authority, of no Use and
 Service to *Him*; and to *Him*, that is, to the
 Communicant, the Author has said only,
 that Consecrations are of no Service.

YOUR

YOUR Ninth Remark, which follows next, is on the Accuracy and Sincerity of the Author of The Plain Account; in saying, That the *Only End* for which our Lord instituted this Duty, was the *Remembrance of Himself*, and yet acknowledging that by its *Tendency* it leads our Thoughts, and consequently should our Practice, to all that is Good, to all that it is necessary for us to ask of God, or to act Ourselves towards our Advancement in it. But, Sir, tho' we should allow that *This is the Tendency* of our Observance of this Institution, and that This and more which You have quoted from the Author, may be included in a Serious Remembrance of our Saviour, and the Death which he underwent for Our Sakes; yet I don't apprehend but that we may say, without a *shameless Front*, or any Inconsistency at the same time, that the *Only End of the Institution*, as it appears from the Scriptures, where alone we have an Account of it, is the *Remembrance of our Lord and Master*.

YOUR next Remark, which is in Answer to what the Author has said on the Benefits of *Christ's Death*, "that we are not intitled
 "to them by partaking of this Sacrament
 "worthily,"

“worthily,” I must confess is somewhat odd and surprizing. He has said with great Propriety, What is founded both on Reason and Scripture, “that the Pardon of Sins past “is promis’d only to Those who *actually* “amend their Lives, whereas the Partaking “of the Sacrament is not an actual Amend- “ment, but implies only a Resolution and “Disposition to it.” But you take upon you to affirm, by what Authority I don’t know, that a Conscientious Partaking of this Holy Sacrament *is actual Amendment*; and that if we do not by any Viciousness in the After-course of our Lives contradict this Profession, it is our Title to Forgiveness and Remission of Sins, and All the Benefits of *Christ’s* Death.—But This, Sir, give me leave to say, is a Doctrine which the Scriptures of God no-where teach; and I defy you to produce an Instance of any Promises in the Gospel of the Forgiveness of Sins, to the Performance of this Duty of partaking of the Sacrament. Archbishop *Tillotson* has taught you in the Paragraph already quoted, and I believe He knew and understood the Gospel as well as You and I can pretend to do, that These Ritual and Instrumental Parts
of

of Religion are only pleasing to God *in Order to Moral Virtues, and so far* as they tend to beget and promote them in us. I must confess, that you are very *Bold to declare in the Name of Christ*, who has never declar'd any such thing Himself, that *all Christian Graces are United and Exercis'd to the utmost, in this One comprehensive Duty, and that we shall by it be Partakers of all the Benefits of Christ's Death.*

It appears to Me very plain from the Reasons which the Author has given, that the Sense of the Word *Communion*, or in Greek *κοινωνία*, where it is us'd by St. Paul especially, must be confin'd to Eating his Body and Drinking his Blood *as a Society of Christ's Disciples*; and nothing which you have said in your next Remark, which relates to this Word only, seems in the least to prove the Contrary: Neither indeed do I understand what you mean by That Sublime Expression, of *a close Conjunction and Vital Union of the Church with Christ.*

LET us proceed therefore to consider your next Remark, which is on This Expression of the Author's, " that the Death of Christ " is the only Seal of the Covenant, and that " there

“ there can be no Other:” An Assertion, you say, which can proceed from nothing but *a wilful Mistake, or Judicial Blindness*. To make this appear, you give us a long and particular Account of the Covenant between God the Father and Mankind; which you do in Terms so familiar, as tho’ you had been Yourself One of the Council: And tho’ just before you enter upon it, you say that *Christ* was not a Party in it, yet in the Detail you represent him, as “ first proposing to take
 “ Human Nature upon him, and in That Na-
 “ ture to perform perfect Obedience to the
 “ whole Law of God, which Man ought to
 “ have done, and moreover to shed his Blood
 “ as an Atonement to God’s offended Jus-
 “ tice.” I think, if This is so, that He did rightly and properly Seal this Covenant with his Blood: And then, as One of the Three-One-Holy, (as you express yourself) I suppose you will allow, that He had a Share, or was a considerable Party in it. But in this whole Description of concerting a Scheme as the Means of Man’s Recovery, which you give us with such an Air of Authority, I doubt you had nothing to lead you, but Your Own, or the Imaginations of Other Men,

full as short-sighted and fallible as Yourself; and to Those who pretend not to be wiser above or beyond what is written, the Death of Christ, I believe, will still appear to be the Seal of the New Covenant.

THE Remark I am next to consider, as being next in Order, is on the Author's saying that the Death of *Christ* was the Proof He gave, that the Terms brought by him from God, were truly what he represented them to be; *which*, you say, *was not THE Proof but A Proof*. An Important and Sagacious Observation This! which nothing but the Gravity which you deliver it with, could make me think of replying to. Do you spy Heresy in this Expression, Sir, or is it the Ruling Passion for Cavilling that must be gratify'd? The Author, treating of the Seal of the Christian Covenant, in the Course of his Argument has these Words: " So *Christ's* Death, or *Christ's* Blood, consider'd as the Proof he voluntarily gave, " that the Terms brought by Him, &c." And where is the Impropriety, where the Absurdity of this Expression? But if we should allow that A instead of THE had been more accurate, Is an Author accountable for every

every single Word in his Performance? No, Sir, *This Distinction*, to use One of your Own Expressions, *is more curious than necessary, to be expected from a Caviller, but not from a serious Enquirer after Truth.*

YOUR next Remark, tho' upon a much more material Point, is not more necessary than This; but shows a shameful Perversion or Disregard of the Gospel of *Christ*. Your Adversary has declar'd, you say, "The Uniform Practice of Morality to be the highest Good of Mortal Man, chosen by Ourselves as our Happiness here, and our unspeakable Reward hereafter." I grant you have once quoted him justly, and that he has made this Declaration, so consonant to Reason, Truth, and Scripture; but which, you think, *tho' it might well enough have become an Heathen Writer*, that it should come from the Pen of a Reasoner and a Christian, is altogether Unaccountable and Astonishing. You have likewise quoted with great Indignation an Expression of His in Another Place, that "throughout the New Testament, a Christian's Acceptance of God thro' *Christ* is constantly put upon the System of Moral Duties." And "if This,

you say, “ be true, then Christian Graces
 “ are utterly Useless; Repentance and Faith
 “ cease to be the Conditions of the New
 “ Covenant between God and Man; Man-
 “ kind need not trouble themselves about
 “ Christianity, but may be restor’d to the Fa-
 “ vour of God without a Propitiation; they
 “ may be saved without any Atonement,
 “ and make themselves happy both here and
 “ hereafter, without any other Religion than
 “ what is natural, by the mere virtue of Mo-
 “ ral Performances.” — To all this it is easy
 to answer, that Christian Graces distinct from
 Moral Virtues there are None, and that they
 are only Moral Virtues in Perfection; that
 Repentance and Faith, tho’ they are the Con-
 ditions of the New Covenant, yet are utterly
 fruitless and unavailing without them; that
 our Blessed Saviour, in his Sermon on the
 Mount, where he has so frequently repeated
 the Declarations of Human Happiness, has
 had no Regard to the Faith or Profession of
 Religion, but to the Virtues and Graces of
 the Mind and Temper; and that He has told
 us in so many Words, that the Rewards of
 Heaven and Immortality were not design’d
 for those who made ever so great Pretences
 to

to a Profession of Belief in Him, unless their Conduct and their Temper were suitable to His Commands and Precepts; and therefore tho' our Faith in his Religion may be ever so Orthodox, yet as it may be foreign to real Virtue, and separated from the Practice of it with an honest and sincere Intention, so the Scriptures have assur'd us, that there can be no Expectations of Happiness in Another World, thro' the Efficacy of our Faith. In short, Sir, if you will give yourself the Trouble to consult the Gospel upon this Subject, you will be convinced, not from two or three Passages only, but from the whole End and Tendency and Design of it, that nothing will pass for real Religion before God, but the actual Performance of the several Duties in it, upon Virtuous Principles and Intentions; that there are no other Terms of Acceptance with God Almighty revealed to Mankind, but the Practice of such Virtues as become our Relation to God, and the Dignity of our Nature, and which are profitable and convenient to the true Interests of One Another: And, in a Word, that the Gospel contains no such Suggestions, whatever the Vices of some, and the Su-

Superstitions of Others, may make them believe, as that there are any Privileges of Worship or Profession that can atone for our Immoralities ; but that it is every-where, on the contrary, declar'd in the New Testament, that Our Religion is to be distinguish'd, and we are to shew ourselves to be Good Christians, by the Influence which It has on Every Part of Human Life.

I HAVE been the more full and particular in an Answer to you upon this Head, because I would always oppose a Doctrine which has a Tendency to make us Easy under the Practice of Immorality ; and which may make us believe, that to be Good Christians, it is not necessary to be Good Men.—A Doctrine which, instead of the Exercise of Virtue, teaches us to depend upon the Merits of *Christ* alone, and our Faith in Him, for our Salvation ; which is not the Doctrine of the New Testament, as you have been pleas'd to Assert ; but which has brought Dishonour upon Christianity, and been a real Prejudice to the Progress of it.

YOUR next Remark is on this Expression in The Plain Account, in which the Author says, “ 'Tis a Mistake to call the Sacrament

“ a Renewal of the Covenant on Our Part,
 “ and the Seal of it on God’s.” The Former
 of which (*as you have quoted him*, is a very
 imperfect Description of this Duty, *but in*
his Own Words) is a very improper Descrip-
 tion of this Duty, *as distinguish’d from All*
Others; which, tho’ it makes a great Diffe-
 rence in the Author’s Observation, you have
 been pleas’d, according to your wonted Ac-
 curacy or Justice, to leave out. But when
 this is added, what you have quoted after-
 wards in order to make the Author contra-
 dict Himself, does not at all serve your Pur-
 pose. And because he has said, that the
 calling the Sacrament a Seal of the Cove-
 nant on God’s Part, seems to him to have no
 Foundation in any Sense; you quote some
 other Expressions to prove this Contradic-
 tion again upon him, but which by no means
 amount to it; as that it may be look’d upon
 as a *Token* and *Pledge*, that God is ready to
 pardon and bless us upon the Terms propos’d
 by his Son, &c.

I AM now happily arriv’d to your Six-
 teenth and last Remark, which is an Attempt
 of the same Nature, with full as little Suc-
 cess; there being no Contradiction in your
 Ad-

Adversary's Own Words which you have charg'd upon him. He has said, that " the
 " Lord's Supper is not properly a Fœderal
 " Rite, or a Rite Making and Renewing a
 " Covenant ; and if it succeeds in the Place
 " of the Passover, this will likewise help to
 " shew, that it cannot be Itself a Fœderal or
 " Covenanting Rite." But by a wonderful
 Sagacity, and an ingenious Perception peculiar
 surely to Yourself, you see him *in the next Breath*
confuting himself, and proving the contrary in these Words ; which as you
 have not been Exact in quoting, I shall take
 from the Original, and give the Reader the
 whole Paragraph. " For the Paschal Supper
 " itself was instituted in *Remembrance* of
 " That Redemption or Deliverance of *Is-*
 " *rael* out of *Egypt*, by which God claim'd
 " them for his People. And so the Lord's
 " Supper was instituted for the Remem-
 " brance of That Redemption or Delive-
 " rance of Christians, which God propos'd
 " to them by *Christ* in his New Covenant.
 " As therefore the Passover was a perpetual
 " *Memorial of the One Deliverance, and*
 " *the Covenant* formed upon it, so is
 " the Lord's Supper the *Memorial of the*
 " *Other,*

“ *Other*, and the *Covenant* formed upon
 “ That; and neither of them therefore can
 “ be esteemed as the *actual making those*
 “ *Covenants*, which are only *Remember’d*
 “ *by them.*” I desire you would consider
 again, Sir, and see if instead of a Confuta-
 tion, what he has added *in the next breath*,
 is not a thorough Confirmation and Proof of
 what he had said; that neither the Passover
 nor the Sacrament could be Covenanting
 Rites, when They were instituted as *Memo-*
rials only, or in *Remembrance only of a*
Covenant.

UPON a little farther Consideration, you
 may likewise, perhaps, retract Another Opi-
 nion which you have deliver’d, that *Christ*
 instituted this Supper as a *Pledge* that he
 would give his Life a Ransom; because I be-
 lieve you will find upon Examination, that
 this Supper was instituted for all his Fol-
 lowers to partake of, in *Remembrance* that
 he *had actually* given it a Ransom for Be-
 lievers. As to All that you have added un-
 der this Remark about a *Sacrifice* and an
Altar, it is so intirely above my Compre-
 hension, and I can so little Understand how
 the Lord’s Supper is a Sacrifice offer’d up

to God, when it is only a *Remembrance of the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross*, and how We Christians have any Altar like the *Jews, not in a Figurative, but a Proper Sense*, and what Occasion we have for it, when we have no Sacrifices appointed by our Religion as They had, that till I can perceive what you mean, and it appears consonant to Reason, I can never give my Assent to it.

I HAVE now, Sir, consider'd distinctly Every Remark which you have made on The Plain Account of the Sacrament. I have given all the Attention to the Importance and the Merit of your Performance that I am Master of. I have never quoted you Unjustly, or made you say any thing but in your Own Words, or according to the Natural and Obvious Construction of them. And upon a Serious Review of the Whole Debate, I cannot help saying, and I say it very sincerely, I am sorry on Account of your Character as a Minister of *Christ*, that you should shew so much Bitterness and Animosity towards One of your Order, who has supported his Sentiments all thro

his

his Book with great Seriousness and Piety; and who might therefore expect with Reason, to be us'd with Candour and Christian Charity at least, how much soever he might have Mistaken the Point which he design'd to explain.

I KNOW no more than You do, who is the Author of The Plain Account; but I think *Profane Designs* should never be imputed to any Man, without plain and flagrant Proof: And that an Author who has propos'd his Opinions with so much Gravity, and with such an apparent Sense of Religion, as He has done, is, of All Men, intitled to Respect and Civil Usage; and therefore let His Opinions be how Wrong soever, when you oppos'd what you thought His Errors, You should not have judg'd his *Heart*, and proclaim'd aloud his *Bad Intentions*.

AND besides this Treatment, which is so Unbecoming your Profession as a Minister of Peace and Mercy, You have so little of the Sense of Scripture, so little Argument and Reason on your Side, when it comes to be consider'd rightly apart from your Unfair Quotations, that your Reputation

tion as an Author, I doubt, will not be much to your Advantage; how greatly soever you may plume yourself on the Figure you shall make, in attacking so important and considerable an Adversary.

I HAVE often observ'd in Controversies of this Nature, that if a Book is not Defended, it is thought by many People, whose Sentiments differ from it, that it is therefore Not Defensible. And being convinc'd in my own Mind, that You had shew'd more Spleen to the Author, than Confuted what He had said, in Your Remarks, lest This should make an Impression to the Prejudice of his Performance, which is in My Opinion not only Excellent in Itself, but vastly Useful in its Design, and lest The Author Himself should not have Leisure or Inclination to give You an Answer, both which I much suspect, for the Sake of Truth and the Institution which is the Subject of of the Debate, I have Presum'd to do it for Him.

THE Consideration of your Remarks has taken up so much Room, and the Reader may see so clearly, that if The Plain Account of the Sacrament is Intelligible, Rational,

tional, and according to the Scriptures, Your's, which you call *A Plainer*, and which is directly contrary to it, *cannot be so*, that I have not thought fit to take any Notice of it, which would only tire the Reader to no manner of Purpose. For if His Account is Right, Your's, which is wrote in Opposition to it, must be Wrong; and as I have defended Every Passage of His which You Object to, there's no Occasion to shew any farther, that Your Account is neither Plainer, nor more agreeable to Reason and Scripture.

But before I take my Leave of You, I must desire you to Believe, and God knows 'tis True, that in what I have said in Answer to your Remarks, I have been guided only by the Conviction of my Mind; that I have not been tempted to shew any Partiality, either by a Spleen against You, or a Prejudice in Favour of the Author whom I defend; that Nothing but a Sincere Regard to Truth has Occasion'd you this Trouble; and therefore, I hope, that No Designs may be imputed to Me in Writing and Publishing This Letter, that are Inconsistent with

[54]

with an Honest Christian, and a Sincere En-
quirer after Truth.

I am, SIR,

Jan. 1. 1739.

Your very humble Servant, &c.

*Just published, and sold by J. OSBORN,
at the Golden-Ball, in Pater-noster-Row.*

1. **A** Copy of the Royal Charter, establishing an Hospital for the Maintenance and Education of exposed and deserted young Children. Price 4 *d.*

2. *The Occasional Paper.* Number I. An Address to the Nobility and Gentry, on the Abuse of *Sunday.* Pr. 4 *d.*

3. *Æsop's Fables*, with instructive Morals and Reflections, abstracted from all Party Considerations. Adapted to all Capacities, and design'd to promote Religion, Morality, and universal Benevolence. Containing Two hundred and Forty Fables, with a Cut, engrav'd on Copper, to each Fable, and the Life of *Æsop* prefix'd. Price bound 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

4. A Treatise of Education, proper for the different Capacities of Youth. Price bound 2 *s.*

5. An Historical Account of the Life and Reign of *David* King of *Israel.* By the Author of *Revelation* examin'd with Candour.

6. The History of our Lord and Saviour *Jesus Christ.* In Three Parts. With suitable Meditations and Prayers. Also the Lives of the Holy Apostles and Evangelists. To which is prefix'd, The Life of the Blessed Virgin *Mary*, Mother of our Lord. By *William Reading*, M. A. Adorn'd with Cuts. The 5th Edition. Pr. 5 *s.*

7. Popery disarmed of those Weapons of Force, and those Instruments of Fraud, in which it chiefly trusts. In a Sermon preached at the Cathedral-Church of *Worcester*, November the 5th, 1739. By *Richard Meadowcourt*, A. M. Canon of *Worcester.*

...and John J. O'Sullivan
...the Golden Rule and the Golden Rule...

Copy of the Royal Charter, establishing
an Hospital for the Maintenance and
Education of expelled and destitute young Girls.
Price 4d.

The Original Report. Number 1. An
Account of the Society and of the progress of the same
in the year 1844.

The Society's Public, with instructive lessons and
exercises, adapted to all Capacities, and designed
to promote Religion, Morality, and Industry.
Containing Two hundred and forty
pages, with Col. engraved on Copperplate, and
the title of the present issue.

A Treatise of Education, proper for the
use of the Children of the Poor, and
of the Middle and Lower Orders of the Town, and
of the Country of Great Britain, by the Author.

The History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus
Christ, from his Birth to his Ascension, with
the History of the Apostles, and the History of the Holy
Church, from its Foundation to the present time, in
which is contained the History of the Kings, Princes,
and Popes, from the Birth of Christ to the present time.

The History of the Kings, Princes, and Popes, from
the Birth of Christ to the present time, in which is
contained the History of the Kings, Princes, and Popes,
from the Birth of Christ to the present time.

